

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application:	:	Group Art Unit: 2136
James P. Goddard	:	Examiner: Daniel L. Hoang
Serial No.: 10/690,017	:	IBM Corporation
Filed: 10/21/2003	:	Intellectual Property Law
Confirmation No.: 4833	:	Department SHBC/040-3
Title: SYSTEM, METHOD AND PROGRAM	:	1701 North Street
PRODUCT TO DETERMINE SECURITY	:	Endicott, NY 13760
RISK OF AN APPLICATION	:	

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

This "Corrected Second Appeal Brief" is submitted in response to the "Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief" mailed April 18, 2008, and replaces Appellants' "Second Appeal Brief" filed April 15, 2008.

**CORRECTED SECOND APPEAL BRIEF**

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

International Business Machines Corporation is the real party in interest.

**II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no related appeals or interferences.

**III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1, 3, 7-10, 12, 15, 19-20 and 25-37 are pending, Finally Rejected and Appealed.

Claims 2, 4-6, 11, 13-14, 16-18 and 21-24 were previously canceled.

#### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment was submitted after either Final Rejection.

(In response to Appellants' (first) Appeal Brief, the Examiner sent a (second) Final Rejection on November 15, 2007, citing Applicants Background Information as additional prior art in combination with previously cited Goldfeder et al. Appellants choose to file this Second Appeal Brief instead of responding to the (second) Final Rejection.)

#### V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

**Support for each claim element is indicated in plain brackets [ ].**

Claim 1 recites a computer implemented method for evaluating a security risk of an application. [Computer program implementing automated processes 200 and 300.] A determination is made whether the application is shared by different customers [Decision 308 of Figure 3. Page 8 lines 16-17. First program instructions of original claim 24.] A determination is made whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by the application. [Decisions 212 and 225 of Figure 2. Page 7 lines 1-2 and 9-11.] A determination is made whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by the application. [Decision 217 and 224 of Figure 2. Pages 7 lines 6-9.] A numerical value or weight is assigned to each of the foregoing determinations. [Steps 310, Step 226, Step 215, Step 222. Page 7 lines 6-15. Page 8 lines 17-18] Each of the numerical values or weights corresponds to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating the security risk. [Page 2 lines 7-10 and 16-18. Second program instructions of original claim 21] The numerical values or weights are combined to evaluate the security risk. [Page 4 lines 6-10. Page 7 lines 14-15, Step 310 and Page 8 lines 17-18, Steps 204, 215, 222 and 230, Page 7 lines 6-9 and 14-15].

Claim 25 recites a computer program product for evaluating a security risk of an application. [Computer program implementing automated processes 200 and 300.] First program instructions determine whether the application is shared by different customers [Decision 308 of Figure 3. Page 8 lines 16-17. First program instructions of original claim 24.] Second program instructions determine whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by the application. [Decisions 212 and 225 of Figure 2. Page 7 lines 1-2 and 9-11.] Third program instructions determine whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by the application. [Decision 217 and 224 of Figure 2. Pages 7 lines 6-9.] Fourth program instructions assign a numerical value or weight to each of the foregoing determinations. [Steps 310, Step 226, Step 215, Step 222. Page 7 lines 6-15. Page 8 lines 17-18] Each of the numerical values or weights corresponds to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating the security risk. [Page 2 lines 7-10 and 16-18. Second program instructions of original claim 21] Fifth program instructions combine the numerical values or weights to evaluate the security risk. [Page 4 lines 6-10. Page 7 lines 14-15, Step 310 and Page 8 lines 17-18, Steps 204, 215, 222 and 230, Page 7 lines 6-9 and 14-15].

Claim 32 recites a computer program product for evaluating a security risk of an application. [Computer program implementing automated processes 200 and 300.] First program instructions determine whether a vulnerability in the application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to the application or a system in which the application runs. [Decision 240 of Figure 2. Page 7 lines 15-18.] Second program instructions determine whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by the application. [Decisions 212 and 225 of Figure 2. Page 7 lines 1-2 and 9-11.] Third program instructions assign a numerical value or weight to each of the foregoing determinations. [Step 242 doubling a value assigned in step 214, 215, 222, 226 and/or 228. Page 7 lines 15-18. Step 226, Page 7 lines 9-11.] Each of the numerical values or weights correspond to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating the security risk. [Page 2 lines 7-10 and 17-18. Third determining step of original claim 22.] Fourth program instructions combine the numerical values or weights to evaluate the security risk. [Page 4 lines

6-10. Page 7 lines 14-15, Steps 240, 242 and 204, Steps 225, 226 and 230, Page 7 lines 6-9 and 14-15].

## VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Claims 1, 3, 7-10, 12, 15, 19-20 and 25-37 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based on Goldfeder et al. (US Publication No. 20040230835) in view of Applicants' Background Information (from Applicants' patent application).

## VII. Argument

A proper rejection under 35 USC 103 requires, at a minimum, that the Examiner cite references that disclose or suggest all the elements of the claim. See In re. Rijckaert, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956-57 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Otherwise, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness.

### **35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 7-10, 12, 19-20, 30-31 and 36-37 based on Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background Information**

Claim 1 recites a computer implemented method for evaluating a security risk of an application. A determination is made whether the application is shared by different customers. A determination is made whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by the application. A determination is made whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by the application. A numerical value or weight is assigned to each of the foregoing determinations. Each of the numerical values or weights corresponds to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating the security risk. The numerical values or weights are combined to evaluate the security risk.

Goldfeder et al. recite "Most users understand that new programs can introduce viruses or other malicious code on their computers." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 002 of the Background section. "The application 201 may contain a virus or it may constitute spy ware." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0018. Goldfeder et al. also disclose evaluation of a security risk of an application. "For instance a virus evaluator may be configured to examine each component of an application for the possibility that the application contains a virus." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0035. This is simply scanning the application itself for the presence of virus code. In contrast, the present invention as recited in claim 1 determines if an application is shared by different customers or vulnerable to some type of attack by external factors - a vulnerability where a third party can

have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by said application or a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by the application. The vulnerabilities recited in claim 1 are to external attacks not based on the presence of a virus in the application in contrast to Goldfeder et al.

Goldfeder et al. also disclose: "For instance, a scoring engine may have determined that the application has requested sufficient permissions to read and modify files on the computer, and to transmit data over a network connection. Based on that information, together with perhaps other evidence, a privacy evaluator may have determined that the application is likely to share the user's information over the network." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0039. This is an analysis of an application to determine whether a virus has caused the application itself to be malicious, i.e. likely to have accessed files and improperly transmitted file data over a network. Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or even suggest the step of determining if an application itself is shared (used) by different customers as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or even suggest the step of determining whether a third party can have unauthorized **administrative authority** to data maintained by the application as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or suggest either of these factors weighted in an algorithm to determine security risk. Moreover, Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or suggest either of these determinations in a computer implemented process for evaluating a security risk.

Applicants' Background section of the present patent application states,

"Every software application poses some security risks. The risks include unauthorized access, attack by hackers, computer viruses and worms, loss or corruption of data, loss of availability to data or the application and theft of proprietary or personal data. The vulnerabilities can be caused by programming errors, configuration problems or application design errors." Paragraph [0002].

Therefore, Applicants' Background Information does not fill the gap of Goldfeder et al., and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed.

Claims 3, 7-10, 12, 19-20, 30-31 and 36-37 depend on claim 1, and therefore distinguish over Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background Information for the same reasons that claim 1 distinguishes thereover. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 7-10, 12, 19-20, 30-31 and 36-37 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed.

**35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 25-28  
based on Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background Information**

Independent claim 25 distinguishes over Goldfeder et al. and Applicants Background Information for the same reasons that claim 1 distinguishes thereover. Therefore, the rejection of claim 25 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed. Claims 26-28 depend on claim 25, and therefore the rejection of claims 26-28 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed for the same reasons.

**35 USC 103 Rejection of Claims 32-34  
based on Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background Information**

Claim 32 recites a computer program product for evaluating a security risk of an application. First program instructions determine whether a vulnerability in the application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to the application or a system in which the application runs. Second program instructions determine whether a third party can have unauthorized **administrative authority** to data maintained by the application. Third program instructions assign a numerical value or weight to each of the foregoing determinations. Each of the numerical values or weights corresponds to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating the security risk. Fourth program instructions combine the numerical values or weights to evaluate the security risk.

As noted above, Goldfeder et al. recite "Most users understand that new programs can introduce viruses or other malicious code on their computers." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 002 of the Background section. "The application 201 may contain a virus or it may constitute spy ware." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0018. Goldfeder et al. also recite "Most users understand that new programs can introduce viruses or other malicious code on their computers." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 002 of the Background section. "The application 201 may contain a virus or it may constitute spy ware." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0018. Goldfeder et al. also disclose evaluation of a security risk of an application. "For instance a virus evaluator may be configured to examine each component of an application for the possibility that the application contains a virus." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0035. This is simply scanning the application itself for the presence of virus code. In contrast, the present invention as recited in claim 32 determines whether a **third party** can have unauthorized **administrative authority** to data maintained by the application. This is an external attack not based on the presence of a virus in the application in contrast to Goldfeder et al. Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or even suggest an assessment of security based on whether there is unauthorized **administrative authority**.



Goldfeder et al. also disclose: "For instance, a scoring engine may have determined that the application has requested sufficient permissions to read and modify files on the computer, and to transmit data over a network connection. Based on that information, together with perhaps other evidence, a privacy evaluator may have determined that the application is likely to share the user's information over the network." Goldfeder et al. Paragraph 0039. This is an analysis of an application to determine whether a virus in the application has caused the application to be malicious, i.e. likely to have accessed files and improperly transmitted file data over a network. In contrast, the present invention as recited in claim 32 determines if a **third party** can have unauthorized **administrative authority** to data maintained by the application. This is a much different test than in Goldfeder et al. Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or even suggest this program step of claim 32. Moreover, Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or suggest this determination in a computer implemented process for evaluating a security risk.

Applicants' Background section of the present patent application states,

"Every software application poses some security risks. The risks include unauthorized access, attack by hackers, computer viruses and worms, loss or corruption of data, loss of availability to data or the application and theft of proprietary or personal data. The vulnerabilities can be caused by programming errors, configuration problems or application design errors." Paragraph [0002].

Therefore, Applicants' Background Information does not fill the gap of Goldfeder et al., and the rejection of claim 32 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed.

Claims 33-34 depend on claim 32 and therefore distinguish over Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background information for the same reasons that claim 32 distinguishes thereover. Therefore, the rejection of claims 33-34 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed.

**35 USC 103(a) rejection of Claims 15, 29 and 35**  
**Based on Goldfeder et al.**

Claim 15 depends on claim 1 and further recites the following. A determination is made whether there is a requirement for authentication of the application or a system in which the application runs to other systems **before connection of the application or the system in which the application runs to said other systems**. A numerical value or weight is assigned to this determination and used in evaluating the security risk. To support the rejection of claim 15, the Examiner cites Gold paragraph [0021], " the ADO 221 may include, in object form, the name of the application, the version of the application, what rights and permissions the constituent components of the application desire, privacy policy information, digital signature information, and the like."

The Examiner asserts that "reading the digital signature of an application [is] equivalent to requiring it to authenticate." However, claim 15 specifies another weighted factor to evaluate a security risk, not a process of authentication itself. Goldfeder et al. do not disclose or even suggest the additional weighted factor of claim 15, in combination with those of claim 1, in determining a security risk. Therefore, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed for the same reason that the rejection of claim 1 should be reversed and the additional reason explained above.

Claim 29 depends on claim 25, and further distinguishes over Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background Information as does claim 15. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed for the same reason that the rejection of claim 25 should be reversed and the additional reason explained above.

Claim 35 depends on claim 32, and further distinguishes over Goldfeder et al. and Applicants' Background Information as does claim 15. Therefore, the rejection of claim 35 under 35 USC 103 should be reversed for the same reason that the rejection of claim 32 should be reversed and the additional reason explained above.

Based on the foregoing, the rejection under 35 USC 103 of all pending claims should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 05/02/08  
Telephone: 607-429-4368  
Fax No.: 607-429-4119

/Arthur J. Samodovitz/  
Arthur J. Samodovitz  
Reg. No. 31,297

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX:

1. A computer implemented method for evaluating a security risk of an application, said method comprising the steps of:

determining whether the application is shared by different customers;

determining whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by said application;

determining whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by said application;

assigning a numerical value or weight to each of the foregoing determinations, each of said numerical values or weights corresponding to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating said security risk; and

combining said numerical values or weights to evaluate said security risk.

3. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether said application is subject to industry controls for security; and

assigning a numerical value or weight to the determination whether said application is subject to industry controls for security, and using the numerical value or weight for the determination whether said application is subject to industry controls for security in evaluating said security risk.

7. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether a third party can have unauthorized read and write access to said data; and

assigning a numerical value or weight to the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized read and write access to said data, and using the numerical value or weight for the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized read and write access to said data in evaluating said security risk.

8. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether a vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs; and

assigning a numerical value or weight to the determination whether the vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs and using the numerical value or weight to the determination whether the vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a program or person which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs in evaluating said security risk.

9. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether said data maintained by by said application is confidential; and wherein

the numerical value or weight assigned to the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized write access to said data is based in part on whether said data is confidential.

10. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether a customer has direct use of said application; and

assigning a numerical value or weight to the determination whether a customer has direct use of said application, and using the numerical value or weight for the determination whether a customer has direct use of said application in evaluating said security risk.

12. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether there is an intrusion detection system and vulnerability scanning for said application; and

assigning a numerical value or weight to the determination whether there is an intrusion detection system and vulnerability scanning for said application, and using the numerical value or weight for the determination whether there is an intrusion detection system and vulnerability scanning for said application in evaluating said security risk.

15. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

determining whether there is a requirement for authentication of said application or a system in which said application runs to other systems before connection of said application or said system in which said application runs to said other systems; and

assigning a numerical value or weight to the determination whether there is a requirement for authentication of said application or a system in which said application runs to other systems before connection of said application or said system in which said application runs to said other systems, and using the numerical value or weight for said requirement for authentication in evaluating said security risk.

19. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the step of comparing the evaluation of said security risk to a cost savings provided by said application, and determining whether to certify said application for use based in part on said comparison.

20. A computer implemented method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising the step of comparing the evaluation of said security risk to a revenue provided by said application, and determining whether to certify said application for use based in part on said comparison.

25. A computer program product for evaluating a security risk of an application, said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable media;

first program instructions to determine whether the application is shared by different customers;

second program instructions to determine whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by said application;

third program instructions to determine whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by said application;

fourth program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to each of the foregoing determinations, each of said numerical values or weights corresponding to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating said security risk; and

fifth program instructions to combine said numerical values or weights to evaluate said security risk; and wherein

said first, second, third, fourth and fifth program instructions are recorded on said media.

26. A computer program product as set forth in claim 25 wherein:

said third program instructions determine whether a third party can have unauthorized read and write access to said data;

said fourth program instructions assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized read and write access to said data; and

said fifth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight for the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized read and write access to said data in evaluating said security risk.

27. A computer program product as set forth in claim 25 further comprising:

sixth program instructions to determine whether a vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs; and

seventh program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether the vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs; and wherein

said fifth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight to the determination whether the vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a program or person which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs to evaluate said security risk; and

said sixth and seventh program instructions are recorded on said media in functional form.



28. A computer program product as set forth in claim 25 further comprising:

sixth program instructions to determine whether a customer has direct use of said application; and

seventh program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether a customer has direct use of said application; and wherein

said fifth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight for the determination whether a customer has direct use of said application in evaluating said security risk; and

said sixth and seventh program instructions are recorded on said media.

29. A computer program product as set forth in claim 25 further comprising:

sixth program instructions to determine whether there is a requirement for authentication of said application or a system in which said application runs to other systems before connection of said application or said system in which said application runs to said other systems; and

fifth program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether there is said requirement for authentication; and wherein

said fifth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight for said requirement for authentication in evaluating said security risk; and

said sixth and seventh program instructions are recorded on said media.

30. A computer program product as set forth in claim 25 further comprising:

sixth program instructions to compare the evaluation of said security risk to a cost savings provided by said application, and determine whether to certify said application for use based in part on said comparison; and wherein

said sixth program instructions are recorded on said media.

31. A computer program product as set forth in claim 25 further comprising:

sixth program instructions to compare the evaluation of said security risk to a revenue provided by said application, and determine whether to certify said application for use based in part on said comparison; and wherein

said sixth program instructions are recorded on said media.

32. A computer program product for evaluating a security risk of an application, said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable media;

first program instructions to determine whether a vulnerability in said application can be exploited by a person or program which has not been authenticated to said application or a system in which said application runs;

second program instructions to determine whether a third party can have unauthorized administrative authority to data maintained by said application;

third program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to each of the foregoing determinations, each of said numerical values or weights corresponding to a significance of the respective determination in evaluating said security risk; and

fourth program instructions to combine said numerical values or weights to evaluate said security risk; and wherein

said first, second, third and fourth program instructions are recorded on said media.

33. A computer program product as set forth in claim 32 further comprising:

fifth program instructions to determine whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by said application; and

sixth program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by said application; and wherein

said fourth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight to the determination whether a third party can have unauthorized read and/or write access to data maintained by said application to evaluate said security risk; and

said fifth and sixth program instructions are recorded on said media in functional form.

34. A computer program product as set forth in claim 32 further comprising:

fifth program instructions to determine whether a customer has direct use of said application; and

sixth program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether a customer has direct use of said application; and wherein

said fourth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight for the determination whether a customer has direct use of said application in evaluating said security risk; and

said fifth and sixth program instructions are recorded on said media.

35. A computer program product as set forth in claim 32 further comprising:

fifth program instructions to determine whether there is a requirement for authentication of said application or a system in which said application runs to other systems before connection of said application or said system in which said application runs to said other systems; and

sixth program instructions to assign a numerical value or weight to the determination whether there is said requirement for authentication of said application or said system; and wherein

said fourth program instructions also use the numerical value or weight for said requirement for authentication of said application or said system in evaluating said security risk; and

said fifth and sixth program instructions are recorded on said media.

36. A computer program product as set forth in claim 32 further comprising:

fifth program instructions to compare the evaluation of said security risk to a cost savings provided by said application, and determine whether to certify said application for use based in part on said comparison; and wherein

said fifth program instructions are recorded on said media.

37. A computer program product as set forth in claim 32 further comprising:

fifth program instructions to compare the evaluation of said security risk to a revenue provided by said application, and determine whether to certify said application for use based in part on said comparison; and wherein

said fifth program instructions are recorded on said media.

IX. Evidence Appendix

There is no evidence entered or relied upon in the appeal.

X. Related Proceedings Appendix

There are no related proceedings and therefore no copies of decisions to provide.